

REMARKS

The Office Action of 02/28/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected as being anticipated by Boys. Claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Boys in view of Weindorf. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 5, which has been canceled. Claim 8 has also been amended consistent with original claim 5. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The rejection states in part:

Regarding claim 5, Boys discloses a device wherein the pulse generator (602) is a pulse width modulation generator (Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 39-50) (pulse width modulation is a frequency modulation, so that the PWM generator (602) generates a pulse of number of frequency in a period of time for a number of cycles [refer to col. 7, lines 39-50]).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Pulse width modulation, as understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, refers to varying the duty cycle (proportion of ON time to OFF time, or HIGH time to LOW time) of a periodic pulse waveform.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Boys that the *clock generator 602* of Boys operates in such a fashion.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-8 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 05/29/2007